UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/558,381	02/22/2006	Masato Inoue	126007	4160
25944 OLIFF & BERI	7590 04/02/200 RIDGE, PLC	EXAMINER		
P.O. BOX 3208	350	HARLAN, ROBERT D		
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22320-4850			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1796	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			04/02/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
Office Action Comments	10/558,381	INOUE ET AL.			
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
	Robert D. Harlan	1796			
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply					
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).					
Status					
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on					
	-· action is non-final.				
	-				
closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.					
ologod iir aggordanog with the practice ander E.	x parte gaayle, 1000 G.B. 11, 10	0.0.210.			
Disposition of Claims					
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-17</u> is/are pending in the application.					
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.					
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.					
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-17</u> is/are rejected.					
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.					
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.					
-, <u></u> (-)					
Application Papers					
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.					
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.					
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).					
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).					
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	aminer. Note the attached Office	Action or form PTO-152.			
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
<u>-</u>		(1) (7)			
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some color None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 					
Attachment(s)					
Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)					
2)	Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal Pa				
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>11-29-05, 08/23/2006, 09/24/2007</u> . 6) Other:					



Application No.

Application/Control Number: 10/558,381 Page 2

Art Unit: 1796

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 2. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* **v**. *John Deere*Co., 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:
 - 1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
 - 2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
 - 3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
 - 4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.
- 3. Claims 1-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nishiguchi et al., JP 2003082172 (hereinafter "Nishiguchi" in view of Rodway et al, WO 02/073631 (hereinafter "Rodway"). Nishiguchi teaches a non-crosslinked composite comprising polypropylene, metal hydrate, hindered phenolic antioxidant and sulfur antioxidant and in the quantities

Application/Control Number: 10/558,381

Art Unit: 1796

prescribed by the present invention. See Nishiguchi, Abstract; ¶¶ [0001-0007]. Nishiguchi differs from the present invention in that the present requires a metallic oxide and imidazole based sulfur antioxidant. Rodway teaches in analogous art a wire and cable insulation based on polypropylene composition comprising mercaptobenzimidazole and zinc oxide. See Roday, Abstract; pages 1 & 2.

Page 3

- 4. In recently decided KSR Int'l Co. v. Teleflex, Inc., the Supreme Court unanimously stated "the combination of familiar elements according to known methods is likely to be obvious when it does no more than yield predictable result." In view of Rodway, one having an ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to modify Nishiguchi by using an antioxidant and zinc oxide because both references are directed to propylene composition based wire and cable insulation. Such modification would be obvious because one would expect that the use of additives taught by Nishiguchi would be similarly useful and applicable to the additives taught in Rodway.
- 5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Robert D. Harlan whose telephone number is (571) 272-1102. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Thu, 10 AM 8 PM.

Application/Control Number: 10/558,381

Art Unit: 1796

6. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David W. Wu can be reached on (571) 273-1114. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is

571-273-8300.

7. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Robert D. Harlan/ Primary Examiner Art Unit 1796 Page 4

rdh